

REMARKS***Claim Status***

After entry of this Amendment, Claims 1 – 20 are pending. By this Amendment, Applicants amend Claims 1, 9, 14 – 16 and 18, and add new Claims 19 and 20. No new matter is added.

Telephonic Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview on April 4, 2007. The Examiner's comments were helpful and are incorporated in this amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects Claims 1 – 3, 6 – 8 and 14 – 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Yoriki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,640,431) in view of Trzecieski (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0059194). More particularly, the Examiner asserts that Yoriki discloses the limitations of Claim 1 except for each receiving tool being configured to be moved and controlled individually, wherein components can be mounted independently of external actuators. The Examiner cites Trzecieski as disclosing a multi axis component actuator, wherein each receiving tool is configured to be moved and controlled individually, and wherein components can be mounted independently of external actuators. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to combine the component mounting apparatus of Yoriki with the component actuator of Trzecieski because it would provide active alignment of components. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Without conceding that the Examiner's assertions are proper over Yoriki and Trzecieski, but to expedite examination and allowance of the present application, Applicants amend Claim 1. More particularly, Claim 1 is amended to specify that the multiple insertion head further includes a plurality of active drives, and that each receiving tool is coupled to one of the active drives. These amendments to Claim 1 further distinguish the claimed subject matter over Yoriki.

Dependent Claims 9, 14 – 16 and 18 are amended, as set forth in the above listing of claims.

New Claims 19 and 20 are added to specify that the coupling of each receiving tool to one of the active drives is direct or permanent.

Yoriki does not disclose or suggest a plurality of active drives, wherein each receiving tool is coupled to one of the active drives. Yoriki discloses that only the receiving tool at a certain rotational position is coupled to a drive. The drives are stationary at certain rotational positions of the receiving tools. That is, a receiving tool that is not at such a rotational position is not coupled to a drive. In contrast, amended Claim 1 specifies that each receiving tool is coupled to one of the active drives.

Further, Yoriki does not disclose or suggest that each receiving tool is configured to be moved and controlled individually, and that components can be mounted independently of external actuators. As discussed, Yoriki does not disclose or suggest that each receiving tool is coupled to one of the active drives. Accordingly, each receiving tool can be moved and controlled individually, and components can be mounted independently of external actuators, as defined in amended Claim 1.

Trzecieski discloses a multi axis optical component actuator having several electromagnetic controllable dual axis mechanisms, as shown, e.g., in Fig. 6. However, Trzecieski at least fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of receiving tools and a plurality of active drives of a multiple insertion head, wherein each receiving tool is coupled to one of the active drives.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that even if Yoriki and Trzecieski were combined, such a combination does not disclose or suggest a multiple insertion head, as defined in amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that amended Claim 1 is not obvious over Yoriki in view of Trzecieski. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and to pass amended Claim 1 to allowance.

Claims 2 – 20 depend from Claim 1. For this reason and because of the additional inventive features recited in the dependent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2 – 20 are patentable over Yoriki in view of Trzecieski. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass Claims 2 – 20 to allowance.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner further rejects dependent Claims 4 – 5 as being unpatentable over Yoriki and Trzecieski and further in view of Gieskes (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0074085 A1), and Claims 9 – 13 as being unpatentable over

Yoriki and Trzecieski and further in view of Asai (U.S. Patent No. 5,588,195). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 4 – 5 and 9 – 13 depend from Claim 1. The above arguments are repeated herein. Gieskes or Asai do not provide the missing teachings in Yoriki and Trzecieski to anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 1. Accordingly, at least for the above reasons, Claims 4 – 5 and 9 – 13 are also allowable and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present response is intended to correspond with the Revised Amendment Format. Should any part of the present response not be in full compliance with the requirements of the Revised Amendment Format, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned for immediate correction.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is herewith respectfully requested.

Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' attorney in order to resolve such issues promptly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502464 referencing attorney docket number 2003P00148WOUS.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/23/07


John P. Musone
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,961
Tel: (407) 736 6449
Customer No.: 28204